REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, amendments have been made above so as to obviate each stated ground of objection.

In particular, independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended so as to more particularly describe the claimed invention. The Examiner's apparent desire for the <u>claim</u> to include enablement detail (i.e. such that others skilled in the art could duplicate the invention without trial and error) is erroneous. It is the <u>first</u> paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 which requires <u>the specification</u> to include an enabling disclosure. The <u>second</u> paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 only requires the <u>claim</u> to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as being the invention.

The Examiner's comments about passages in the specification at pages 25 and 26 appear to be requesting clarification of the specification teaching pursuant to the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.. Accordingly, the paragraphs mentioned by the Examiner have been amended above. Clearly Figure 7 is a traditional flow chart where the time axis descends vertically. That is, those skilled in the art will readily understand that the messaging sequence depicted in Figure 7 starts at the top of the figure and proceeds sequentially in time towards the bottom.

Similarly, the summary paragraph at page 26 referring to the fact that both types of communication frames can be started "at the earliest timing" using applicants' mediating unit 31 would be well understood in the art to merely be describing the fact that by using alternating

BAN et al.

Appl. No. 10/775,241

September 25, 2006

transmission priorities, each type of communication frame can be started quickly without

favoring either type (e.g., see Figure 3).

Claim 5 has been amended so as to avoid the phrase "at approximately a same time".

Claims 8-10 have been amended so as to avoid the phrase "any one of".

Accordingly, all outstanding formal issues are now believed to have been resolved.

Attention is also directed to new method claims 11-13. It will be seen that independent

method claim 11 can be analogized to independent apparatus claims 1 and 5 while new

dependent method claims 12 and 13 add yet further patentable distinction to the claimed

invention.

There being no other outstanding issues, it is believed that this entire application is now

in condition for allowance and accordingly a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

LSN:dm

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

-9-

1101583